

houses as they were bought or built. As more houses were obtained the income would grow in snowball fashion and the accumulating funds used for obtaining still more houses. The results would be negligible at first, but in time would be not inconsiderable. It would induce the birth of superior children. Moreover it would be a practical demonstration of eugenics and no doubt attract increasing attention to it. Further, the *Eugenics Society* in course of time would possess valuable property, which would enable the aims of positive eugenics to be usefully advanced.

J. HAY MARSHALL.

Gerrards Cross,  
Bucks.

### The Non-sane Non-insane Offender

To the Editor, *Eugenics Review*

SIR,—Readers of your admirable journal are (as you in your notes remark) under considerable obligation to Dr. Norwood East, whose signature guarantees the grace and brilliance of the contributions it follows. Nevertheless, in your report of the Galton Lecture there is a paragraph (p. 8, col. 1) which saddened me. "Lack of religious education . . . frank selfishness . . . cupidity is the modern goal . . . search for pleasure grows apace . . ." etc. This sort of thing simply won't do. Imagine the consternation of a reader who sits down to a course of hard-boiled scientist and is served a portion of underdone bishop.

CLIFFORD TROKE.

The Press Club,  
London, E.C.4.

### "Modern Marriage"

To the Editor, *Eugenics Review*

SIR,—May I comment on Mr. Cecil Binney's review of my book, *Modern Marriage*, in the January number, not because I am concerned with the effects of his review on the book, which is quite able to stand on its own feet, but because some of the things he says appear to me to be most misleading.

He says that the book is concerned with sex rather than marriage, "as is shown by its disregard of the obviously pressing question of divorce." But the book is essentially concerned with the other end of marriage—preparation rather than divorce.

Then again, Mr. Binney takes exception to the word "modern," but this is a relative term which I have taken to cover the last twenty years. The subjects discussed would certainly not have been considered in Victorian times or, for that matter, in any other era.

My chief quarrel with Mr. Binney, however, is over his statement that "most of the writer's opinions have been generally accepted for the last quarter-century by all intelligent people." I qualified twenty-five years ago, but never found that my teachers, friends or fellow students knew or accepted these opinions but then, of course, they

may not have been very intelligent. No one taught us anything about sex and the views that one did hear expressed showed a lamentable ignorance of the simplest facts in the book. So far as I am aware, no medical school gave any teaching in either the psychology of sex or the practice of contraception. If the subject was mentioned at all it was treated as a joke.

The truth is that the majority of the population knew hardly any of the facts contained in *Modern Marriage*, and the result of this gross ignorance has been gradually brought to light in our consulting rooms and Women's Welfare Clinics during the past twenty years. Nor is the position very much better to-day. It is the experience of those of us who are working in the field of marriage guidance that one of the chief causes of marital disharmony is ignorance of the simplest facts of sexual life. It is no exaggeration to say that in practically every case of marriage breakdown some degree of sexual maladjustment will be found to exist either as the root cause of the conflict or as a symptom of it.

In any case the book was never written for the highly intelligent people to whom Mr. Binney refers. It was written as the result of ten years' work in one of the largest panel practices in this country, where I discovered for the first time the appalling ignorance about these matters which was, and still is, exhibited by every section of the population. Indeed, some of the most difficult cases one has to deal with occur among the so-called intelligent people to whom Mr. Binney refers.

I do not say in the book that the trend of the age is towards quality rather than quantity, on the contrary I have pointed out that we are breeding dysgenically, and it is most important to consider quality rather than quantity, an entirely different matter, and one with which Mr. Binney must surely be in agreement. I am not unaware of the feelings of dislike that many women have with regard to the use of contraceptives, nor do I ignore that fact that many people who are feeling in good health dislike consulting doctors. I consider that the well-adjusted and well-educated woman of the future will have no such irrational fears.

One of our most important educative functions is to remove from the minds of the public the idea that the doctor is someone who can only be consulted during ill health. The whole purpose of *Modern Marriage* is to encourage people to view their sex lives reasonably and to seek advice before marriage and, one must hope, before damage has been done, rather than wait till difficulties have arisen which could have been so easily prevented by a little forethought.

Those who have knowledge of these matters should do everything in their power to present the public with simple, reliable and accurate information. To adopt Mr. Binney's complacent attitude is to ignore the facts.

EDWARD F. GRIFFITH.

25 Park Crescent, W.1.